DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 146 983 JC 770 568

TITLE Proceedings of the Patterns Workshop on Career/Goal Changing and Transfer/Articulation Implications (Rochester Institute of Technology, October 16-18, 1977).
INSTITUTION Rochester Inst. of Tech., N.Y.
PUB DATE Oct 77
NOTE 32p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Articulation (Program); Career Change; College Admission; *College Cooperation; College Credits; Community Colleges; Degree Requirements; Educational Coordination; Educational Counseling; Educational Problems; *Higher Education; *Junior Colleges; *Transfer Students; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS Experiential Learning; Reverse Transfer Students

ABSTRACT

The 1977 Patterns Workshop focused upon the special problems of those students who change, adjust and revise their career goals in the middle of their college experience. Texts of five speeches given at the conference are presented and include: (1) Articulation In an Anarchical World, keynote address by Dorothy M. Knoell, discussing major areas of difficulty in facilitating student progress from one level to the next, primarily the portability of credit awarded for achievement in other than regularly scheduled courses; (2) Articulation Between Community Junior Colleges and the Four-Year Institutions, by Sharon MacLaren, providing an historical perspective on articulation problems and suggestions for lessening them; (3) Other Measures of Expected Competencies, by Richard L. Rinehart, examining different approaches to evaluating the experiences of career change students in terms of the criteria for college degrees; (4) Communication and Intercollege Cooperation, by J. Norman Hostetter, discussing information that needs to be made available to transfer students; and (5) Where Is All the Information About Transfers?, by Ernest W. Beals, discussing the Transfer Information Service program. The workshop agenda and a list of participants are provided. (LH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED146983

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Center for Community/Junior College Relations TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

1977 PATTERNS WORKSHOP

ON

CAREER/GOAL CHANGING AND TRANSFER/ARTICULATION IMPLICATIONS

sponsored by

Rochester Institute of Technology

Rochester, New York

JC 770 568

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Theme and Faculty	1
Participants	2
Keynote - Dorothy Knoell	4
Topic No. 2 - Sharon MacLaren	14
Topic No. 3 - Richard L. Rinehart	19
Topic No. 4 - J. Norman Hostetter	21
Topic No. 5 - Ernest Beals	25
Career Decisions - Paul Kazmierski	30

Rochester Institute of Technology

Patterns 1977

Institute College
Center for Community/Junior
College Relations

One Lomb Memorial Drive
Rochester, New York 14623
716-464-2001

CAREER/GOAL CHANGING AND TRANSFER/ARTICULATION IMPLICATIONS

Schedule: *All meetings will be in the Genesee Room. Coffee breaks & special group activities will be held as part of the five topic sessions.*

Sunday, 10/16	6:00 p.m.	Begin Registration
	7:00 p.m.	Keynote Address - Dr. Dorothy Knoell Followed by Wine & Cheese Reception
Monday, 10/17	9:00 a.m.	Topic #1 - Dr. Paul Kazmierski
	11:30 a.m.	Lunch
	12:30 p.m.	Topic #2 - Dr. Sharon MacLaren
	3:00 p.m.	Topic #3 - Dr. Richard Rinehart
	4:00 p.m.	Miscellaneous Questions & Conversations - Workshop Faculty
	Evening	Group & Individual Arrangements
Tuesday, 10/18	9:00 a.m.	Topic #4 - J. Norman Hostetter
	11:30 a.m.	Lunch
	12:30 p.m.	Topic #5 - Dr. Ernest Beals
	2:15 p.m.	Summary Session
	3:00 p.m.	Adjournment
	3:00-4:00 p.m.	Open Evaluation Session

TOPICS:

1. *Assisting the individual in developing the personal skills of career decision making at this state in their life and education and the abilities to change goals when necessary.*
2. *Understanding and evaluating the basis for and validity of transfer requirements, grades, test scores, and expected studies involved in Baccalaureate degrees, emphasizing the necessary responsibilities and prerogatives of faculty members for communications and transfer shock accommodation as well as academic standards.*
3. *Understanding the potentials, limits, and appropriate use of other methods and measures of expected competencies, (credit by examination, CLEP, portfolios, etc.), for those not fitting standard agreements for transfer.*
4. *Defining the need for procedural simplifications, common forms, processes, and policies. Responsibilities for effective articulation and reverse transfer will be included, in the context of consumerism ethics.*
5. *Developing and maintaining effective and efficient systems of communication and intercollege cooperation, data collection involving the many different individual situations, public-private college systems, and the continuing evolution of new fields and options.*

1977 "Patterns" Workshop:

THEME - CAREER/GOAL CHANGING AND TRANSFER/ARTICULATION IMPLICATIONS:

A workshop for counselors, faculty members and administrators in two and four year colleges focusing on the special problems of those students who are changing, shifting, adjusting, and revising their career goals in the middle of their college experiences. These could include individuals who, for example, might:

a. be completing their Liberal Arts or General Associate degree who now feel a strong need to enter a specific and possibly a specialized career program requiring further education,

b. be completing a technical/occupational program and decide that they wish to change their career goal and seek a baccalaureate degree that may not be directly related to their first studies,

c. have completed one or two years of college some years ago who now desire to resume their education with new goals,

d. by completing an Associate degree designed for transfer but not deciding to change their career plan to something else requiring specialized studies (e.g., Business Administration major now deciding to enter Packaging or other similar specialities),

e. be a reverse transfer wanting to enter a specialized occupational program.

The workshop would be planned to identify specific articulation problems, to evaluate the validities of such problems, and to analyze and understand the kinds of systems and facilitations that would be appropriate and necessary to solve the problems.

WORKSHOP FACULTY:

Dr. Ernest Beals, Associate Director, Southern Regional Office, College Board

J. Norman Hostetter, Coordinator of Admissions & Financial Aid, Office of the Vice Chancellor to Educational Services, State University of New York

Dr. Paul Kazmierski, Director, Learning Development Center, Rochester Institute of Technology

Dr. Dorothy M. Knoell, Higher Education Specialist, California Postsecondary Education Commission

Dr. Sharon A. MacLaren, Academic Dean, St. Joseph College, Connecticut

Dr. Richard L. Rinehart, Chairman, Center for Community/Junior College Relations, Rochester Institute of Technology

PARTICIPANTS - 1977 PATTERNS CONFERENCE - October 16, 17, 18, 1977

Donald Baker - Rochester Institute of Technology
William Bates - Boston University, Massachusetts
Ernest Beals - Southern Regional Office, College Board, Georgia
Hiram Bell - Rochester Institute of Technology
Sharon Bungard - West Virginia Northern Community College, West Virginia
Larry Carter - Community College of the Finger Lakes
Richard Chapman - SUNY Ag & Tech College at Morrisville
Sheila Conley - Community College of Allegheny County, Pennsylvania
Kathleen Dexter - University of Maine at Augusta, Maine
Sally Downer - Junior College of Albany
Baron Duncan - Onondaga Community College
Janie Gaines - College of Staten Island
H. Guido Gellis - University of Cincinnati, Raymond Walters College, Ohio
Peter Giopulos - Rochester Institute of Technology
Richard Gleaum - Genesee Community College
Susan Glover - Rochester Institute of Technology
Dane Gordon - Rochester Institute of Technology
Ann Hayes - Rochester Institute of Technology
Ron Holloway - New York City Community College
J. Norman Hostetter - State University of New York
Charles Jenkins - State University College at Brockport
Carol Johnson - Rochester Institute of Technology
Paul Kazmierski - Rochester Institute of Technology
Dorothy Knoell - California Postsecondary Education Commission, California
Noel Kopala - Cuyahoga Community College, Ohio
Sister Mary Lauretta - Villa Maria College
Don Leonard - Genesee Community College
Sharon MacLaren - St. Joseph College, Connecticut
Garrett McAuliffe - University of Massachusetts, Massachusetts
Judith McGaughey - New York City Community College
Walter Milinski - Community College of Allegheny County, Pennsylvania
Thomas Molski - Dutchess Community College
Harry Papagan - West Virginia Northern Community College
Nick Proia - Monroe Community College

PARTICIPANTS - 1977 PATTERNS CONFERENCE - October 16, 17, 18, 1977

F. Wayne Reno - University of Cincinnati, Raymond Walters College, Ohio
Richard Rinehart - Rochester Institute of Technology
Marjorie Rodgers - University of Maine, Maine
Marian Satre - Rochester Institute of Technology
Roy Satre - Rochester Institute of Technology
Jean Schanker - Rochester Institute of Technology
Dick Schmonsky - Columbia-Greene Community College
Frank Schreckenberger - Villa Maria College
Mary Solomita - Cape Cod Community College, Massachusetts
Jeannette Turner - Cushing Junior College, Pennsylvania
Sondra Valle - Dutchess Community College, Poughkeepsie, NY 12601
James Wooten - College of Staten Island

ARTICULATION IN AN ANARCHICAL WORLD

Dorothy M. Knoell
California Postsecondary Education Commission

Background

About ten years ago we felt that we were well on the way to having plans developed for solving most problems of articulation between two-year and four-year colleges, at least in the public sector of higher education. We had completed a monumental transfer study involving more than 7,000 junior college transfer students in 43 four-year colleges and universities in ten states, with guidance from the national associations most concerned with the outcomes of such a study -- The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, the Association of American Colleges, and the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers. Conferences were held in each of the states for the purpose of reviewing and refining guidelines for improving articulation, from which emerged a national framework within which state and local articulation policies might be developed.

There were still other reasons for believing that the major problems of transfer students had been solved. The two-year colleges had become recognized in most states as full partners in higher education, with good attitudes and a new spirit of cooperation developing in both sectors. Furthermore, enrollment growth ensured that there would be plenty of students for both types of institution in the years to come. Finally, formal, state-level coordinating agencies had begun to emerge which created a new threat of mandated articulation and thus served to energize voluntary efforts.

Two of these three conditions still prevail: acceptance of what are now for the most part community colleges, and the presence of state agencies for planning and coordination (now often referred to as "1202 commissions" under federal legislation). The old guidelines appear to be working well enough for traditional students transferring between two- and four-year colleges but the simplistic articulation model on which they were based no longer fits the complex flow of students which we are witnessing today. We are confronted at this time with declining enrollments of "regular" students for whom the articulation policies were developed -- the full-time students who begin their transfer programs at age 18 in a community college and transfer two years later in junior standing. At the same time, we have very uncertain predictions and expectations about the enrollment patterns and objectives of the new lifelong learners, mid-career changers, and really late starters. What we find is that articulation groups are spending a great deal of time on transfer problems affecting a very small number of students but failing to look for new problems which our new student constituencies are encountering in trying to transfer.

Changes are now occurring in the world of higher education which may have the effect of squeezing the community colleges into a quite different mold. Their nature, their mission, their very functions may change if the phenomenon of declining enrollments becomes a kind of death wish for higher education. Four-year colleges and universities become less willing to share lower division students with the community colleges as in past years of abundant enrollments. The limitless numbers of adults who might profit from further education are virtually ignored at articulation conferences, while the focus of attention continues to be the traditional student.

Causes for Alarm

Before turning to new articulation problems brought about by changing circumstances, I should like to call attention to six "happenings" which may have considerable impact on the enrollment of "regular" students.

1. Vastly increased student financial aid is making it possible for needy students to enroll in their first-choice institutions as freshmen, thus reducing the number of students who attend community colleges for primarily financial reasons.

2. "Higher education" has been superseded by the concept of "postsecondary education" with proprietary schools now eligible for publicly funded student aid and, together with regional occupational centers, adult schools, and other educational structures for students at least 18 years of age now included in state-level planning and coordination efforts.

3. Increased student interest in specific preparation for employment is causing baccalaureate institutions to take a new interest in occupational education, including fields which have been the rather exclusive province of the community colleges until now.

4. Student affirmative action is taking hold in baccalaureate institutions, with the result that underprepared, disadvantaged students from ethnic/racial minority groups who formerly enrolled in community colleges are now being recruited directly into four-year colleges and universities.

5. Baccalaureate institutions are also showing a new concern for declining skills exhibited by entering freshmen (writing, reading, and computing) and are instituting remedial programs and services, rather than requiring deficient students to enroll in community colleges until they can meet standards.

6. Alternative opportunities for postsecondary education with new delivery systems are being developed to provide expanded access for the underserved and to make it easier for nontraditional students to pursue their studies, for example, weekend colleges, television and other automated instruction, and recognition of experiential learning as a valid means of attaining certain education objectives.

In the absence of a new draft for miliary service or a state mandate to divert first-time freshmen to two-year colleges, the community colleges will probably lose large numbers of traditional students with both occupational and baccalaureate degree objectives in the next few years. At the same time, it appears unlikely that their mission will revert to simply vocational/technical education. Instead, the colleges may (and perhaps already have) become centers for adult learners with a wide range of educational and career experiences and objectives, some of whom will simply be "passing through" the community colleges in pursuit of other goals.

Community colleges have tended to take a somewhat limited view of their mission in the past, by stressing the preparation of youth for entry-level employment. In reality we find that a great many community college students are already employed in some capacity and are enrolled in college with the objective of doing their jobs better, getting a better job in the same field, changing career fields, and/or pursuing general education for other than employment objectives. While one-and two-year curricula are required preparation for some jobs, at least two-thirds can be filled by persons with no specialized training beyond high school which cannot be done on the job. Many community college students are employed in such jobs while enrolled.

Community colleges have also tended to think about articulation as a vertical process beginning with high school but directed toward the baccalaureate institution. Other postsecondary institutions and programs, most noticeably those offering occupational education, have been virtually ignored in articulation activities. Given the current devaluing of the college degree by the general public, it seems likely that noncollegiate offerings at the postsecondary level will expand and that community colleges will need to cope with them as part of their articulation programs.

Finally, the supreme threat to the community colleges as they engage in innovative practices is that baccalaureate institutions will not honor the credit awarded. Thus four-year institutions may award credit to their own students for experiential learning, challenge examinations, independent study, and the like, but community colleges are reluctant to do so out of fear that such credit "won't transfer." Community colleges feel constrained to counsel transfer students into highly prescribed programs of freshman and sophomore courses comparable to those offered by the receiving institution, with no chance to qualify for other kinds of credit. Thus the community colleges may face difficult times, with growing competition from the noncollegiate sector of postsecondary education on the one hand, and from baccalaureate institutions on the other, which have new incentives to be more responsive to changing student needs.

Where Do We Go From Here?

There appear to be four general problem areas in which work is needed to resolve new problems of articulation and student flow. These areas are:

1. Articulation with the expanding world of postsecondary vocational/technical education;

2. Credit for work experience and other experiential learning;

3. Setting common standards for awarding credit and waiving requirements; and

4. Evaluation of the "reverse transfer" student.

Cutting across these areas is the issue of the collegiate institutions becoming brokers for nontraditional students.

Postsecondary Vocational/Technical Education

Articulation with other postsecondary institutions and agencies offering vocational/technical education to high school graduates and others with equivalent preparation is viewed as the most critical of the four areas outlined. The scope of such efforts may include publicly funded adult schools and regional occupational centers, as well as proprietary/independent institutions. The private vocational schools have become another recognized segment of postsecondary education, to be taken into account in state, regional, and local planning. They may be accredited; their students may receive publicly funded financial aid; and they may contract with public colleges to provide training programs for students in community colleges and elsewhere. It is not entirely unreasonable that their graduates should expect to be given full or partial credit for their achievements if they wish to transfer to a community college or other collegiate institution, particularly when both institutions prepare students for entry into the same career fields. Students from private postsecondary institutions may try to transfer into the same curriculum in order to work toward an associate degree, for example, in dental hygiene, or to work toward a degree in another field, for example, sociology, with elective credit sought for the prior occupational training. Still others may seek upgrading in the field in which the private school prepared them, for example, from licensed vocational nursing to a registered nursing degree. Clock hour/credit hour equivalencies need to be established and performance standards agreed upon. If such students are denied reasonable access to degree programs except on a "begin again" basis, their schools may well move up into the collegiate sector, thus creating even greater competition for students than at present.

The prospects are somewhat less promising for "transfer" from public postsecondary vocational programs to community colleges although "articulation" may be required under new state plans and regulations. With increasing costs and decreasing resources, there are new incentives for colleges to cooperate in the offering of costly training programs rather than compete for students. In California legislation approved last year established regional adult and vocational education councils which include community colleges, regional occupational centers/programs, private postsecondary schools, high schools, and CETA programs. These councils are required to develop both a delineation of function agreement and an articulation agreement during their first year of operation, with the general objective of making possible the smooth transition of students between institutions and continuous progress in their chosen specialization, while avoiding or reducing duplication of programs and services.

Four-year institutions are not presently a part of the problem of articulation between community colleges and other postsecondary institutions. However, the long-term implications for upward mobility, retraining, and lifelong learning cannot be ignored for long.

Credit For Experience

A large segment of the population goes to work after leaving high school and develops competencies through experience and on-the-job training which may be similar to those developed in community college curricula. Both men and women who

have been out of school for some time are being enouraged to take advantage of expanded opportunities for postsecondary education. In the case of women, mobility programs in employment necessitate their taking postsecondary courses in order to move up the ladder from clerical positions. Other women not in the labor market are going to college to satisfy a variety of goals. Men may enroll for retraining, upgrading, or simply to do their jobs better.

The issue is the appropriateness of awarding credit on the basis of their various competencies gained through experiences outside postsecondary institutions and programs. It is assumed that the competencies can be described in terms of behavioral outcomes and demonstrated and/or documented in some objective fashion. Given these assumptions to be true, so-called "challenge" examinations are one procedure for awarding credit. However, such exams are unpopular with faculty since such activities are not included in their teaching load. More important, competencies gained through experience may not be organized in neat packages corresponding to college courses. An alternative approach may be to equate credit to a given number of years of successful job experience (or hours of volunteer work or other quantitative measure), as is now done in evaluating applicants' qualifications for civil service examinations and teaching credentials in vocational education.

The question is then one of what kind of credit: satisfaction of major requirements when the student seeks a degree in the field of his experience, or elective credit toward degree requirements in another major. For example, should an auto mechanic or a secretary be able to gain credit for their demonstrated competencies, and may such credit be used to satisfy major and/or other degree requirements? If the answers are "yes" in the community college, will these students lose their credits if they later transfer to baccalaureate institutions? Two- and four-year colleges have reached agreement in the past concerning credit for military service. The Commission on Educational Credit of the American Council on Education has a current Military Evaluation Program to assist students and institutions in evaluating current service-acquired proficiencies. It would seem sensible that guidelines be developed and used to award credit for comparable civilian, extra-institutionally acquired competencies.

The Problem of Standards

The availability of standardized tests for use in the demonstration of competencies has not always facilitated articulation and transfer! Differing standards, for example, minimum scores required for the awarding of credit, have been a problem among institutions in the same segment as well as between two- and four-year institutions. The issue is complex! Should the "norm" be established so that only the "best" students are awarded credit, for example, the top ten percent? Those performing in the upper half of the score distribution for some norm group ("native" students, seniors, national norm groups, or other)? Or all those attaining some minimum performance level determined by the faculty to be adequate? Differences in the choice of the norm group or standard reflect differences in philosophy concerning the award of credit by

examination. Some feel that such awards of credit should be a kind of reward to outstanding students, to the few who make very high scores. Others view credit by examination as a means whereby large numbers of students may satisfy lower division requirements and thus accelerate progress toward their degrees.

Still another controversy focuses on the uses to which such credit may be put. The three chief uses are the satisfaction of specific subject-matter requirements. for example, freshman English; the satisfaction of general, area requirements, for example, the humanities; and the waiving of requirements (or placement), generally without credit, and the substitution of other requirements to provide more depth or breadth. The waiving of specific requirements is likely to cause problems for transfer students if such requirements must also be satisfied for the baccalaureate degree. Such students may find that they are charged with subject deficiencies when they are ready to graduate and/or enter graduate school.

The controversy over credit by examination has let some colleges to record specific courses on their transcripts for which such credit is awarded, without revealing that the student was not actually enrolled in the course. The grade assigned may be simply "credit" or a letter-grade equivalent to the test score earned. Institutions to which students with such credit transfer tend to object to the practice of 'concealing' the means by which the student earned the credit and request that full information about the test form, date of administration, score, norm group used, and the like be inscribed on the transcript. With this information in hand, the receiving institution may decide not to honor the credit by examination and thus charge the student with subject deficiencies. The defense for such action is not strong since receiving institutions seldom disallow credit on the basis of the differing values of their letter grades. Still another type of illogical action is the denial of credit earned by examination when the transfer has excellent grades in the courses in which he enrolled subsequently, some of which had the course in question as a prerequisite.

The conditions under which students may seek credit by examination are also open to criticism, although not necessarily in the context of transfer/articulation. Before the advent of the College Level Examination Program, many colleges had policies which denied students the opportunity to gain credit by examination (usually by "challenging") until they had attained advanced standing and unless they had achieved a grade-point average of B or better. Such policies, many of which are still in effect, make it impossible for exceptionally well prepared freshmen to get basic requirements out of the way by challenge or placement examinations. By the time they have reached sophomore standing, they will have enrolled (unnecessarily) in the courses they might have challenged successfully. Restrictive policies also work against freshmen in occupational curricula who have had good basic preparation prior to college admission. For example the student with skills acquired in a secondary school program in auto mechanics was not able to challenge the basic course in college until his sophomore year, when it was too late.

Still, problems associated with the use of CLEP, the Proficiency Examination Program, and other credit-by-examination programs are less serious for transfer students than those brought on by the use of other evaluation techniques for awarding credit for experiential learning. Some of the techniques involve the evaluation

of portfolios assembled by students; live performances (vocal, instrumental, the dance); oral interviews, often involving panels of questioners/evaluators; and work samples, often produced in standardized problem-solving situations. The issues involve standards, reliability, objectivity, and relevance. Each of these issues can be resolved within a single institution (or division thereof), but take on new significance when a student transfers to another institution and expects credit "to transfer" which has been earned by means other than enrollment in courses. In most instances it is possible to obtain some type of permanent record of the student performance which has been evaluated for credit -- the portfolio itself, audio- and video-tape recordings, and photographs. There should be no problem in making and retaining a record of the evaluation of the student performance, including criteria and standards used and ratings/recommendations rendered.

However, problems arise when the institution to which a student transfers insists upon reevaluating the credit awarded on the basis of student "performance" outside regular courses and/or challenge examinations. The problem is less severe when credit thus awarded has been used to satisfy elective requirements than in the case of general education or major requirements. In the latter instance, when prior credit is not accepted at full value for transfers, it is difficult at times to construct a reasonable program of studies to get the transfer student to his degree objective, that is, one which will not require the student to spend time in courses whose content he has already mastered. The flow of students between institutions and from undergraduate to graduate and professional study will indeed be impeded if agreements are not worked out for honoring credit earned in nontraditional fashion.

The Office of Educational Credit of the American Council on Education and the Cooperative Assessment of Experiential Learning group are doing a great deal to facilitate and standardize the evaluation of learning which has taken place outside college- and university-sponsored programs. OEC publishes a Newsletter three times a year, together with guides and directories. The Newsletter contains a column on articulation/transfer which has tended to deal with more general topics than the transfer of credit for extra-institutional learning. Lack of attention to the transfer issue creates some feeling of disbelief that community colleges will be able to award such credit to students who have intentions to transfer.

The Reverse Transfer Student

A fairly new phenomenon is the community college "reverse transfer" student who is not in academic or other difficulty in the four-year college but, instead, seeks occupational education offered by the most part by two-year colleges at the present time. Some reverse transfers do so before entering the upper division; other complete baccalaureate degrees before seeking occupational preparation. Priority in admission to impacted programs is an issue which cannot be dealt with here but is serious. Instead, we will focus on the problem of the community college evaluating the reverse transfer student for purposes of placement, awarding credit, and advisement. Community colleges may be no less rigid than universities in evaluating transfer credit, although for different reasons. Reverse transfers seldom fit neatly into prescribed occupational curricula which have rigid sequences

of courses with prerequisites, clinical training, and/or required work experience. They often have completed portions of prerequisites and sequences of courses in programs which do not parallel those organized by community colleges for occupational objectives. As a result, they may find it possible to enroll in no more than one or two courses per term, and necessary to enroll for a period of at least two years in order to complete the prescribed program without repeating work.

Related to the reverse transfer problem is the dilemma of what is lower versus upper division level work in fields which prepare students for entry level employment. The problem is becoming more acute as four-year institutions increase their numbers and range of occupational programs offered at the upper division level. They differ from the programs offered by the two-year colleges largely in the prescription of lower division prerequisites which must be completed prior to enrollment in the specialized program. The several levels of preparation programs leading to the Registered Nurse license provide an old but good example of what is happening in other occupational fields -- police science, fire science and certain health occupations, although in the case of nursing the baccalaureate programs came first. Articulation between the various nursing programs has been a problem since the associate degree program was first developed. It appears that articulation will be even more difficult when programs which were first offered by two-year colleges are later expanded into four-year curricula. While we give lip service to lifelong learning, we have still made little provision for the continuing vocational and personal development of graduates of community college occupational programs. Does the two-year college mission encompass continuing education for graduates, in credit or other kinds of courses and programs?

The Brokering Function

It may not be possible for two- and four-year colleges and universities to work together (and with other postsecondary agencies and institutions) in a way which will permit students with diverse talents and accomplishments to move from one institution, program, or educational level to the next without undergoing reexamination, reevaluation, and repetition of prior learning experiences. Educational brokering appears to be a logical component of the community service mission of the community college, to help local residents who are not affiliated with any postsecondary institution to get back into courses, programs, and institutions. Ideally the community college would be able to use a variety of evaluation techniques which would both aid in the educational and career counseling of potential students and provide a basis for recommending the awarding of advanced placement standing and/or degree credit. Neither the community college nor any other regularly accredited institution can perform such services satisfactorily unless a serious attempt is made to expand articulation activities so as to make provision for the transfer of credit awarded for experiential learning which has been properly evaluated.

In the absence of such articulation, it seems likely that external agencies will increase in number and scope which will not only evaluate and advise but also award degrees and certificates. The Regents External Degree Program, recently

granted full accreditation by the Middle States Association, is but one example of such a service. In California, private educational brokering services are being established which contract with accredited institutions to gain admission to courses and programs for their student/clients. Given the current situation of declining enrollments of "regular" students and increasing interest in "recurrent" education, it appears that the time has come for colleges and universities to decide whether they wish to cope with new articulation problems and, if so, how. The least desirable course of action appears to be to do nothing to improve articulation along the lines suggested, thus inviting legislative intervention to create a new agency to do so, or to mandate the awarding of credit for learning which has taken place outside collegiate institutions.

Summary

The major areas in which attention to new kinds of articulation problems needs to be given are said to be:

1. Articulation with postsecondary proprietary schools, regional occupational centers, and other adult education agencies which offer occupational education, to facilitate student progress in courses and programs from one level to the next, without undue hardship to the student;

2. Agreement among and between two- and four-year colleges and universities concerning the evaluation of learning which has taken place outside collegiate auspices (including 1 above), particularly work experience and on-the-job training;

3. Standards for awarding credit and agreements about the use of such credit, to insure its portability, where use is made of national examination programs, challenge examinations, and the evaluation of portfolios, work samples, interview panels, and performances in the arts; and

4. Evaluation and placement of the "reverse transfer" student seeking occupational education in the community colleges after completing two or more years of a baccalaureate program.

The overriding issue is the portability of credit awarded for achievement in other than regularly scheduled courses offered by collegiate institutions, particularly from two- to four-year institutions. The issue involves the role of brokering agencies for student/clients and the appropriateness of the state, private organizations, and/or collegiate institutions to do such brokering, that is, evaluation, recommendation, advisement, and placement.

New articulation problems have been discussed in the context of expected changes in the distribution of students in postsecondary education occurring as a result of increased student financial aid, student affirmative action, willingness of four-year institutions to do remediation, the new interest of four-year institutions in occupational education, and the growth of nontraditional postsecondary education.

In addressing new problems of articulation, two- and four-year colleges appear to have the options of (1) clinging to the old guidelines and agreements, which are applicable to an ever small group of traditional students, and (2) opening up degree programs and other awards to new kinds of students who have reached their admissions offices by unorthodox means. Fears about standards and the integrity of the degree tend to hold institutions and faculties as we now know them may be at stake if they do not change in time to meet the new needs of adult students.

ARTICULATION BETWEEN COMMUNITY JUNIOR COLLEGES AND THE FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS

Sharon MacLaren

I. Historical Perspective on the Problem

A. What has been happening in the Community Junior College that has brought articulation problems in the forefront of University-Community College relations?

The problem of articulation between these two institutions was not great prior to the late 1920's and 1930's. Up to that time the role of the junior college was pretty much limited to the preparation of students for transfer to the junior year at the university. The community college faculty member recognized this as the role and advised students accordingly. Advisory manuals were constructed to indicate what was needed, course equivalents indicated in the manual were matters of agreement with faculty members at neighboring universities, and follow-up visits to former students on university campuses were conducted by community college administrators or faculty members. In short, there was an attitude on the part of community college faculty that cooperation with universities was necessary if the community college was to survive. From the 1930's on, this picture began to change dramatically.

By the 1950's community college faculty members had generally accepted the non-transfer function as a legitimate function for the community college. They began to realize how few of their students were actually completing an A.A. degree and were transfering with this degree to four-year institutions. They began to develop more programs of a non-transfer type which they sold on the market place to job-interested students. A philosophy split occurred along technical academic lines.

Concomitant with this change in function were three other changes that were taking place in the community junior colleges. These three changes it seems to me were the most influential factors in the increased problems noted by community college transfers.

The first is the change in the funding of community junior colleges. Before the 1930's community junior colleges had to rely entirely on funds derived from their local community. As more and more technical and occupational programs were established, however, these schools had to turn to the state for necessary funding. Because of the economic value of such programs to the state the community colleges received the state funds they requested, becoming competitors with the university for state resources. A conflict situation thus was established--on economic as well as philosophical grounds.

The second change that had a major impact on articulation was the change in the character of the faculty of community colleges that took place from the 1950's on. Early in the community college movement until the 1950's at least, community college faculty tended to be former high school teachers who had managed to complete a masters degree in education while teaching in the secondary school. Since the 1930's and more definitely since the 1950's two other types of individuals have begun to replace the traditional community college faculty member. On the one hand, there has been an increase in non-degree faculty members who teach in technical occupational programs. On the other hand there has been an increase in recently degreed faculty who have just completed graduate level (at either the masters or Ph.d. level) in their discipline. The articulation problems brought about by the addition of these individuals to the community junior college faculty are quite distinct. The bringing of these two types of individuals together on the same

campus has precipitated internal problems for the community colleges quite apart from articulation problems. Earlier all advisement of students was conducted by faculty members. With the change in faculty there has been more and more pressure to leave advisement to non-faculty staff. There has been an increase in advisement centers generally staffed by individuals of a student personnel bent rather than an academic bent.

B. Clarification of the problems brought about by the addition of non-degreed faculty to the community college--university perspective

A generally accepted policy among the faculty of four-year institutions is that courses taught for credit in a degree program should be taught by an individual who has at least the degree for which the credit is given. For example individuals teaching undergraduate courses should have at least a bachelor's degree. Individuals who teach doctoral level courses should have the doctorate. Exceptions are made, but only under very unusual circumstances. It is the general acceptance of this policy which has allowed for the general acceptance of bachelor's degree completed at one institution for admission to graduate work without penalty at another. (But even with this assurance, let me add, students are sometimes required to take undergraduate work to make up for requirements that was needed for a degree at their undergraduate institution.)

The question then arises among university faculty as to why they should accept college level work taught by individuals who would not be qualified to teach college level work at their institution. The question was asked yesterday--but not answered.

What is college level work? The answer is quite simple. College level work is work that is recognized for college credit by a given faculty. What is acceptable for <u>given</u> college credit by one faculty toward their degree is not necessarily accepted for college credit by another faculty for their degree.

As I indicated earlier most of the non-degreed faculty members who have been brought on to the faculties of community colleges have been brought on to teach in the technical occupational programs. In general these are programs that are of a different character entirely than the traditional higher education program. Their intent is different, and their outcomes are different. The problem, it seems to me, is that we have attempted to make occupational courses fit the academic way of proceeding, therefore bringing about confusion and ultimately having a negative effect on the academic way of proceeding. For example--in occupational training what is intended is to train individuals for occupational competence. When an individual is competent to do what is required (at least minimally competent) the training group certifies that the individual can in fact perform certain tasks. The academic way of proceeding, on the other hand, is to further develop the capabilities of the student.

Because of the confusion about these ways of proceeding, many colleges and universities have adapted academic modes of operation which are appropriate for occupational programs. The effect has been disastrous in terms of the overall educational level of our graduates. For instance with respect to testing for competence, you either have it or you don't. The S-U or pass-fail grading system makes sense. With respect to testing for development it is not a case of you have or have not developed. There are degrees of development. A grading system is more appropriate to this way of proceeding. The whole area of testing for

placement is another one that has had a negative effect on the educational level of graduates. Using the traditional academic way of proceeding, placement exams were given to aid the proper placement of students only. No credit was given for developmental benefits received. Students were still expected to accumulate the minimum number of credits toward their development regardless of how many courses they place out of. Since the confusion has set in we now have students earning credits through placement exams. Exams that were developed for different purposes are being used differently. Students are now able to count that credit toward their minimum hours required to graduate. The result is less development on the part of our students than there might otherwise be.

One other point should be made about the standards and acceptability of credits given in what is traditionally not college level work. Even the faculty of the community colleges themselves recognize the credit distinctions between these courses and courses taught by "qualified" college level faculty. For this reason there are two distinct degrees granted by community colleges. An A.A. degree is generally differentiated from an A.S. degree in the community college. If all courses were equally acceptable to faculties in both types of degree programs there would be no need for two separate degrees.

C. Clarification of the problems brought about by the addition of faculty members with MA's or Ph.D's in their disciplines to the community college--university perspective

The increase in university interested community college faculty have brought about quite a different set of problems with respect to articulation. These individuals very often have just completed specialized work at a certain level in a specialized area of a discipline. Understandably these young specialists want to teach courses in their special area of interest, that is what they feel they know best. The difficulty that arises here, however, is that often courses in their area of specialization are taught at the upper level or the graduate level in the university. They are then courses that are taken as part of a major requirement for the degree. The main point that should be made here, it seems to me, is that a faculty of a given institution is responsible for validating that a student has shown at least a minimal level of development in courses required for their major. In order to ensure that upper level and graduate courses are taught by people who have themselves developed at this level, universities generally have a policy that only faculty who have a Ph.D. in their discipline can teach courses at this level. Unless university faculties are familiar with the people teaching specialized courses at the community college and unless these individuals have the necessary credentials, the university faculty are quite justified in not accepting the course as comparable to theirs. University faculty will generally accept major credits taken at other accredited universities because they know their policies to be essentially the same and they are confident that only people qualified at a certain level would be allowed to teach specialized courses.

But many of the community college faculty do have Ph.D. and are qualified to teach at a certain level of development. The problem is that they are an unknown quantity and quality to the university faculties who see them only in the context of an institution that does not require its faculty to be developed at a Ph.D. level. The question then becomes who should be responsible for making university faculty members aware of the quality of expertise that exists in the community college. Should the university be the responsible agent? Should it

send its faculty around to community college to investigate the facilities in which various courses are taught, the library of the community college, and the quality of its faculty? In other words, should it be conducting accreditation visits as once was the pattern? Or should the individual faculty member who wishes to teach a specialized course and have it accepted by university faculties make himself or herself known to the university faculties recognizing that they are ultimately responsible for validating that the student has developed to a certain level in the course? It seems to me that the second approach makes more sense in the context of our present day circumstances. Because of the conflict relationship that has existed between community colleges and universities since the 1930's, the watchdog approach on the part of senior institutions would be most unwelcomed. It seems to me, however, that the responsibility of the faculty at the senior institutions should be recognized, and that it just makes good sense that those who want recognition for their course by the responsible bodies should make themselves and their course known to that body. Sending a course description to the Registrar's Office after the course has been initiated is not enough. University faculties don't accept that from their own colleagues; why should they accept it from someone at another institution. In other words, if the community college faculty member were a member of a university faculty he or she would still have to seek recognition of the departmental faculty before initiating the course.

D. The non-involvement of university faculties in the happenings at the community colleges

In the early days of the community junior colleges, university faculty members played a large role in the design of the community college courses. They actually had responsibility for accrediting these courses. As the conflict relationship between the two institutions grew, however, less and less involvement was invited. The community colleges in attempting to develop the new identity began to look to other community college colleagues to accredit their programs. Generally university faculty have had little to do with community colleges since then. Most university faculty members did not attend one, teach in one, or even visit one.

By the time the states began to require cooperation between these two institutions and university administrators were finally convinced of the need for cooperation, the faculty members were far removed from the community college world and indeed antagonistic to it. Because the task of persuading the faculty looked to be too great, university administrators made what seems to me to be a great error. They developed administrative staffs to cope with the multitude of articulation problems that would meet the transfer student. It was these staff members who would travel to the community colleges explaining the university programs and recruiting students. It was these staff members who became involved in the acceptance of transfer credit. It was these staff members who were responsible for writing and implementing articulation agreements. The university faculty members were allowed to remain aloof from the whole problem and promise of the transfer student. University faculty members still see little need to be involved in these questions.

Perhaps it is because these faculty members have not been involved that there have been so few spokesmen who articulate the basic philosophical issues regarding what is college credit, what is a bachelor's degree, how is competence distinct from development in the scheme of things, etc.

II. What Can Be Done to Lessen the Articulation Problems Students Now Encounter In Transfer From Community College to the University

A. What can be done at the university

1. Articulation of the meaning of things (like credit, degrees) to students, community leaders, legislatures, and community college personnel

2. Build ways in which faculty become familiar with community colleges without threatening community college staff (recruitment visits, guest lectures, university seminars, involvement with community college organizations, internship programs, involvement with state discipline organizations)

3. Be sure that university faculty are involved in all decisions concerning credit to be given and articulation agreements made

4. Encourage faculty to be consistent in their dealings with students as possible. Don't have double standards

B. What can be done at the community college

1. Articulation of the meaning of things (line credit, competence degrees to students)

2. Encourage faculty to recognize the validation function of university faculty at the bachelor's degree level and to relate to university faculty as they would their own colleagues in obtaining recognition for their courses

3. Be honest with students about the articulation agreements that do and don't exist---catalogue statements, program materials, etc.

In summarizing I'd like to make one point that I think needs to be articulated over and over again so that it might be understood by students or anyothers who may not be aware of it.

A bachelor's degree is the recognition by a given faculty given to a student who has developed to a level that is acceptable to them in those areas of development that they think is important.

Because it is a recognition given by a given faculty the meaning of the degree can change as the faculty changes. It will be a different animal at a given institution than at another and it will be a different animal at the same institution in different eras.

As the faculty changes so does the meaning of a degree.

OTHER MEASURES OF EXPECTED COMPETENCIES

Richard L. Rinehart

In order to intelligently arrange articulation for career change students, we should be able to find means of evaluating experience in terms of the criteria for college degrees. There are apparently some problems however; it still isn't happening. Some of the problems involve the intervening variable assumption that we know what a degree means.

In some people's minds it does mean two years of association with the faculty for an associate's degree and four years for a baccalaureate degree. This association apparently develops the understandings, relationships, and the guided learning that is ultimately signified by the degree; however, we still don't agree upon the particular competencies required for the degree. We all have in our catalogs a statement of goals and yet we rarely have those goals translated into competencies that can be measured and therefore be used as criteria for granting credit or waiving degree requirements. We do have this basic conflict of role: whether higher education is to facilitate learning, or to do certification of learning.

There is another set of articulation problems: differing student concerns and expectations about college. It seems to be true that there are many students who are looking upon college as a means of broadening themselves, as a means of learning. They wouldn't want to have the whole thing cut short. The group that we are talking about today is probably more interested in the time and cost of obtaining the degree. They want the learning but they don't want to expend more time than necessary. Those things create problems in using nontraditional measures of students in articulation decisions. This presentation is planned as a discussion of some other specific procedures.

Most institutions do have some kind of policy about credit by examination, and these include specially prepared tests. The actual operation of the policy usually varies from department to department. When someone has had noncredited learning (it may be independent study) in a certain area that is covered by a credit course, there is the potential of having the faculty take the responsibility for preparing a special examination for that particular course and giving credit by examination. We have obvious problems with this, some of them involving economics, but they have never been insurmountable. Do you pay the faculty member for preparing and grading the examination or not. I really don't think that is a serious problem. In some cases the faculty would rather not get paid if it is part of the regular operation in certain institutions anyway. If we have started paying them for preparing special examinations, on the assumption that it is outside of their regular responsibility, then maybe they would have to do something else to make up for it--spend more time in teaching.

There are the problems of establishing, in written or oral testing, in a few hours, whether or not a person has mastered things that are covered in a four or six credit course. These concern about making that examination fair to everyone--fair to the others taking the course, fair to the public who is expecting certain things from the college, and fair to the individual taking the exam.

The other kinds of credit by examination involve CLEP and the other standardized examinations. They are used in various places in different ways. For example, the examination in chemistry may not be accepted if the person is a chemistry major but it will be accepted for a non-chemistry major. In this example, the chemistry department's feeling may be that it doesn't cover what is done in Chemistry 101 well enough that we really feel sure about the person going on to quantitative analysis, etc. But

it is all right for persons in another department as part of general education. The more times we have exceptions like this the more difficult it is to explain the policy on CLEP. I think this is illustrative of some problems in using CLEP in two-year and four-year colleges.

There are such things as portfolios of student work. I thought I would bring in a sample of this type of portfolio and talk about it for a minute. The College of Photography at RIT requires students to submit this kind of a portfolio for admission to the program and to see whether or not the person can eliminate certain required courses. They also allow persons, on the basis of a portfolio, to get credit for certain courses. Portfolios of student-produced work certainly can be used in other programs besides photography and fine arts. We do have the equivalents of this kind of portfolio in some engineering technology programs around the country. A qualified and competent faculty member can judge whether or not indeed this illustrates a particular skill level on the part of a student. Other kinds of portfolios would be auditions and performances in performing arts--music particularly. Music schools by and large either award credit toward the degree or waive courses on this basis. This kind of a portfolio could be extended to some other kinds of degree programs.

A related type of a portfolio is the kind used by Empire State College and in other programs. It is a portfolio of student's experiences: journals, logs, diaries, coupled with written statements and summarizations and letters of recommendations. Documented experience is closely related to that but I wanted to distinguish it a little bit. We have an external Masters' degree for people who are teaching engineering technology. If a student's work experiences as an engineer or designer are such that they seem to be closely related to the content of a course, they may submit documentation of the experience. In these cases, our guideline says that it is not appropriate if it is the same kind of thing that baccalaureate students do, but if it shows evidence of creativity and of specific responsibility for coming up with a new procedure, then we can award credit. In that case we do ask for letters of documentation about this specific experience from the employers for whom the work was done. Another step in the process is an oral interview. The student will come in and defend the documentation.

I now want to look at these kinds of instruments and devices in another view, and say where do we use these. We use them in recruiting. Some kind of an evaluation involving transfer credit potential usually takes place right at the beginning stages. Moving from recruiting, the selection for admission to a specified program is one of the areas where tests of various sorts are used. I am suggesting that special kinds of evaluations can be used in addition to the test scores, grade point averages, and whatever else might be provided by the student. The next step would be classification at the grade level or a classification in sequential studies. Placement is a process in which some test scores or credit by examination might be used. Some of these other devices might be used for specialized placement. If placement is not satisfactory, the student may very well say, "Okay you selected me but you didn't place me, therefore I am deselecting myself and I am going somewhere else where they do give me credit for this."

Summarizing at this point, we are concerned with the appropriate use of non-traditional measures of articulation, in terms of the meanings or goals of the collegiate degree. It is proposed that colleges make more use of the above described procedures even though we have philosophical and goal uncertainties. I would like to discuss this possibility with you.

COMMUNICATION AND INTERCOLLEGE COOPERATION

J. Norman Hostetter

Director, Access Services, SUNY

Access Services is a central staff level office of the State University of New York. We work out of Albany, have 64 campuses, and enroll 340,000 students. Each year we are involved in the admissions and financial aid side of the operation. Under my direction, we have decided that admissions is no longer selection; it is a matter of communication. We have been concentrating much more on the publications which we put out to try to tell the people of New York State what is going on in higher education within the state university. Many times we find that a student approaching the state university doesn't really know how to get ahold of those 64 campuses, or what to expect from the offices that they contact. Therefore we are in the business of making an introduction to the university to the students and their parents. Copies of our functional statements are being passed around. If you want more information or more copies, please write to me. We have a group known as the state operated campuses plus the community colleges.

The community colleges for the fall have around 36,100 students and this is over the 1976 enrollment. That is not to say that all campuses are overenrolled. When we looked at the pattern we see that some of them are underenrolled, and others are well overenrolled. Liberal arts is down again slightly and the career, technical programs are up a little bit. There is an interesting item though as far as the transfers are concerned. In the fall of 1976 we enrolled 4,642 transfers to community colleges. This year we enrolled 5,255 or a 13.2% increase. This gets into the phenonema then of the four-to-two year transfer and the two-year-to-two year transfer. I felt that this was a significant increase. The state operated colleges enrollments at this time (preliminary figures as of September 26)show that first time students are overenrolled by about 2%; and the transfers are underenrolled by about 5%. These are campus goals as compared to fall figures. Fall '76 figures were exceeded but the campus goals were somewhat higher than the number of students that were brought in.

After listening to the conversations of the last couple of days, I think that the state university system is at the point of solving some very particular problems in articulation as far as transfers are concerned. Once these are solved then we will have our problems on an individual basis as a student goes from one place to another. Basically the transfer system should work pretty well. You may know that we have a guarantee for students who have the AA and AS degree to enter a senior college in a parallel program and to receive junior standing. We monitor this quite closely. We have a way for students to reply to the central office--not to the individual colleges--if they are not able to receive that kind of treatment when they go to the campus. We do know that that is working. That does not cover the AAS graduate, the technical graduate, and the AOS graduate having less liberal arts than the other degrees.

We have a problem with the student who is changing majors; for example, the liberal arts student who has taken the humanities major and is now set to pick up a science major when attending the four-year college. The misunderstandings which go with this receive more publicity than I think they deserve. If the student has changed academic goals, it is to be expected that the number of credits transferred will be reduced. At what point in time do you tell a student this, and how often must you tell a student this in order for the student not to be very upset when that decline in credit comes. This is one of those communication problems that I was referring to earlier.

There are two academic areas that we are having a great deal of difficulty with. One is business and the requirements of the AACSB. Highly technical courses do not transfer. In many business program the community colleges are trying to help the student prepare to do a very specific job at the end of two years, and at the same time be able to transfer.

Another problem area is the area of nursing. I think our problem reflects the turmoil in the nursing profession. That is the fact that the nursing profession is having a difficult time deciding whether or not the RN is the legitimate entry point into the nursing profession or whether the baccalaureate is required.

Another problem that is cropping up more and more is the problem of the individual studies degree. As the number of transfer students decline and the number of transfer spaces increases the pressure is upon each college to bring in the student. So when the college does not have a particular degree program it is the old idea of the student saying, "What kind of programs do you have?" and the college representative saying, "Well, what do you want?" The student: "I would like something. . .", the college: "Oh we can design that--it is called individual studies degree or special studies." Of course there are the students who want to go to a specific institution, no matter what kind of a degree they get, and there are students who want a very specific program. You have to delineate between these. The students who want a legitimate program are encouraged not to look at individual studies degrees because of difficulties they are going to have at a later time when they are going to want to make the transfer or go on to graduate school.

The last problem that I want to mention is the area of bureaucratic problems. We have, as any large organization, set ourselves up in tiers or responsibility--offices of responsibility--the admissions people, the housing people, the financial aid people, the dean of students, orientation, and no one seems to talk together at the institutional level. That is an overstatement--some do a very good job. To illustrate my point there are people giving conflicting information to transfer students. The student is told in one letter to have housing and in the next letter you don't have housing, or that you go to this office for credit evaluation and when you get there they say, "Oh no, that's the responsibility of that office over there." We must do more to bring together the services for transfer students much in the same way that we have done for the first time student entering an institution. I think we do a disservice to the student when we are unable to give them the answers that they need when they come to a campus on a particular day.

Our office, as we look back upon problems like these, becomes one of a communications coordinator. We provide applications, profiles, and another book called "Let's Transfer." This tries to explain some of these things to the unsuspecting student. There is a common application form there used by 47 campuses. We think it is about as simple as we can devise and still get all of the information that the campuses would like. It is used by community colleges, ag and tech, and the four-year colleges.

Some of the community colleges do not belong to the system--it is their option. Some of them feel that they are serving their own region only and that they do not need to be a part of this application procedure and I thoroughly agree with that.

This application allows a student to apply to up to four colleges at one time within the system. Many do not apply to that many. We collect the information on the students centrally and process about 365,000 a year--most of them between November 1 and February 15--and distribute the information to the campuses. We do not make decisions centrally. Each campus has its own admissions decision policy so they make their decisions.

A student who is transferring really needs to know information about transfer in his junior year of high school because in the spring of that year there is a big push to begin to have students and parents think about higher education. You are now at the point where you have completed your high school work, three years of it, what do you want to do next? Ca you make those various kinds of decisions? I am saying that a student in the junior level in the spring of the junior year should be told many of the things that we commonly reserve for students to know until they are ready to transfer in their sophomore year of college.

In the information, the terminology must be understood by the students. We often have a specialized language in admissions and transfer that defies understanding. In interviewing parents and students I ask if they knew what a semester hour is. Usually they do not. They do not know a lot of the terminology that we use and certainly do not understand the differences between and among degrees. We need to do a better job of telling the public what is the difference between and among our degrees.

On that point I have three to four questions that every student should ask when that student is thinking about transferring. The sooner they ask them the better off they are. The first question is, "Can I be admitted?" That is a rather unsuspecting question as far as the student is concerned. If the admissions officer answers, "Yes," that is it. The student feels much better. The student needs to know: "Will my credentials get me into the college or into the major?" Here we get to the point that I was making earlier as far as business education was concerned. The student may be admitted to the college, but not admitted to business education or administration because of those problems.

There are always problems when a faculty will make a decision, and we don't learn about it until a problem draws it to our attention. Generally speaking if you have a GPA at the 2.0 level and a few prerequisites you are eligible for admission to the college but not to the major because of a faculty decision. The issue today as far as the transfer students within the state university is not admission but placement. Too often the student accepts the first step without asking the questions about the second step. My point is that we need to tell the students more.

The second question is, "How much credit will transfer?" This is usually easy to answer. The question that goes with that one is, "Does it apply to the degree?" We have ways of accepting all credit. Students are more intelligent than we give them credit for after they have been in school for a period of time. I think we can talk with them about reading up and being familiar with the general education and distribution requirements. They know what we mean along that line. Unfortunately all colleges do not do it all the same way. We have a way of distinguishing between liberal arts and professional courses only we don't agree with what is in the professional section and what is in the liberal arts section. In some places the education courses are professional; other places they are liberal arts. Educational psychology can be in either direction. The unsuspecting student may be caught with a three hour deficit because what the student looks upon as a capricious decision. The students must become more aware of these ways in which we make decisions about credit--the major/minor courses, and the checking for the fulfillment of major prerequisites. We can bring some of these things to the attention of students once the students have made a few decisions.

Do "D" grades transfer, at departmental option, at the option of just a department chairman in one school but not from another? You have to read carefully along that line if the student has D grades. Credit by examination policy is another area where differences come down the line.

The last question is "What courses must I complete to receive the baccalaureate degree?"

I would say to a student: "Don't pay a deposit anywhere until you get answers to these questions. If you cannot get the answers to these questions then you better look elsewhere. If the institution is unwilling to pay enough attention to you as you are coming in and can give you the answers to these questions then I think you should be wary of what kind of treatment you will receive when you arrive." Another companion question: "Will the courses be offered the two years that I am here?" The fourth question akin to this is, "Is financial aid available?" Most institutions now do have financial aid. My plea is that we help students to become more sophisticated in the work that we are doing, in the differences among institutions; and in doing so alleviate some of their problems.

I do not believe institutions are going to change that much. The law of supply and demand is working too well. My statement would go something like this--if we are going to be statesmen about what we are going to be doing in the future we have got to come to a degree of selflessness where institutions and professionals are concerned. I think precisely the opposite has happened. As we search more diligently for students, we tend to do anything possible to bring the student in, to satisfy our own needs more than the students' needs. There is a need in the future for a selflessness that went on in education years and years ago when the old school marm was in the single room school. It was long hours and lots of work.

I have touched briefly on when the communications about transfers should be concentrated. The primary decision-making period is from the junior level in high school to the second year in college. There is a need generally to communicate to the students the differences in higher education during this time.

Campuses have orientation programs; they don't often concentrate upon the broad spectrum of offerings available to students. We are more concerned with helping them become orientated to the philosophy of that institution. We bring in the experts. In some cases they give three hours of credit for orientation. I think that there is a need during that period of time to get across to the students the smorgasboard of degrees, courses, etc. available to them.

Three things I will leave you with: 1. We have to be very careful of our terminology and what we say to the student who is out there. 2. We have to be careful of the timing--when we say it. We have to sense when the student needs the information. 3. We need to concentrate on an organization for giving and receiving a decision that makes some sense to the transfer student.

Ernest W. Beals, Associate Director, Southern Regional Office, College Entrance Examination Board, Suite 200, 17 Executive Park Drive, Atlanta, Georgia 30329

Back in 1973 at the Airlie House Conference on Transfers, one of the strongest recommendations to come from that meeting of the transfer minds was that data on transfers be compiled, analyzed, displayed, and shared. It is one of the recommendations that apparently has not been implemented. Where is all the data about transfers?

There really hasn't been much to hit the national transfer scene, at least not much since the Knoell and Medsker studies of the mid and late 60's. True, there have been some good doctoral studies on transfers and there are some good institutional studies and a few good statewide reports about transfers, but there really hasn't been much of a coordinated effort to gather, tabulate, analyze, summarize, display, and utilize data about transfers.

It is difficult to nearly impossible to obtain accurate information on the number of transfer students currently enrolled in colleges and universities. As for projecting transfer enrollments in the next few years, it has to be an intuitive questimate as there is no solid transfer student data base on which to build enrollment trends and projections. From the National Center for Educational Statistics one can find all kinds of enrollment data tables and graphs about elementary school students, secondary school students, high school graduates, college and university freshmen, college graduates, etc., etc., but nothing on transfers.

By means of the College Board Admissions Testing Program summary reports and the Student Service program, one can tell that for the third consecutive year women college-bound seniors (rising college freshmen) exceed male college-bound seniors 51.1 percent to 48.9 percent. One can tell that minorities make up 16.1 percent of the 1977 college-bound seniors; the medial parental income for 1977 college-bound seniors is $17,000 and an estimated parental contribution of $1,200; one can go on to tell about high school grades, the number of years studied in specific courses, intended fields of study, educational aspirations, self-assessment of skills and abilities, assistance needs, etc. Not only is this information available on the national level but also on the regional, state, and local levels.

Colleges also get all this information on their freshmen and even subgroups of their freshmen. Validity studies are easily available on persisting freshmen. But I ask you what can you tell me about transfers? With stabilizing and even decreasing freshmen enrollments, the need for knowing about, understanding and servicing transfers becomes a necessity. Carol Herrnstadt Shulman in the Eric 1976 Higher Education Research Report No. 6 states that "Declines in freshmen enrollments of about 10 percent between 1969 and 1975 have been offset by increases of about 34 percent in the admission of undergraduate transfer students."

Transfer students are a relatively new phenomenon on the higher education scene, and there are apparently some very real reasons why more hasn't been done in gathering data about these new students:

> There has been very little previous experience in dealing with this new kind of student. How do we go about it? What do we need to know about them?

Many institutions and agencies still consider the transfer as a second or third cousin to the freshman and hardly worth gathering data on.

Institutions, agencies, and systems of institutions don't budget for data collection on transfers.

If an institution does collect data on transfers it often doesn't have the personnel, expertise, hardware, or time to retrieve it, massage it, and most importantly utilize it.

Data collection instruments specifically designed for use with transfers are hard to come by. Lack of access to common data about transfers does not allow for the development of a good data base thus causing inconsistent and meager pockets of transfer information.

Whether it is institutional, system wide, statewide, or national, a good transfer student data base should be established. Trend analysis, academic planning, projecting, recruiting, accountability, assistance in decision-making and most importantly for better understanding the transfer student so that he/she can be better served are all good reasons to commit time, effort, and money to create data about transfers in equity with that of freshmen.

There is one transfer data project that is in its third and hopefully final developmental stage. It is called simply "The Transfer Information Service," better know as TIS to the 30 or so institutions currently using it.

What is TIS

The Transfer Information Service is a program in its last year of development whereby participating colleges and universities can learn about their transfer student population by means of a self-reported descriptive questionnaire specifically designed with the transfer student in mind. Transfer student data is gathered, tabulated, analyzed, summarized, and displayed on the individual applicant, and cummulative on the pool of applicants for each institution and, if so desired, for an entire system of colleges.

It originated at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst in the Office of Transfer Affairs. From there the Massachusetts State Transfer Articulation Committee three years ago in joint sponsorship with the New England Regional Office of the College Board piloted the program with three institutions in Massachusetts, one in Maine, and one in Pennsylvania. The next year it was refined some more and expanded to include the entire University of Maine eight campus system, the four Connecticut state colleges, three Connecticut community colleges, University of Massachusetts-Boston, and Bentley College. This past year, the ten Massachusetts state colleges, Boston University, American International College, and the University of South Florida were added. Approximately 30,000 students will be involved in TIS this year. It is now sponsored and administered by the central office of the College Board in New York City.

The basic purpose for the development of a systematic Transfer Information Service (TIS) program is to provide colleges and universities with the tools necessary to learn about and study their transfer students as easily as they can now study their freshmen candidates.

What kinds of data are available through TIS?

Migration patterns--where do they come from, where do they go (percentages and kinds of institutions from which they are applying)

Reasons for transfer

Academic performance and characteristics

Past and intended fields of study

Admission and rejection patterns

Financial aid circumstances and needs

Demographic characteristics (sex, age, marital, veteran, ethnic origin, etc.)

Assistance needs (educational/vocational, physical, etc.)

Educational aspirations

Past and upon-transfer work plans

Housing plans

Previous and intended attendance patterns (full-time, part-time, day or evening division, etc.)

How does it operate?

It can operate in two or three ways. The most common way is for the receiving institution to forward the 47 item questionnaire and the one-page answer sheet to the student when he/she writes for a transfer application. There is additional room for up to 13 local questions which a college can ask that it considers unique to its own institution. Ideally the TIS questionnaire could serve as the application form itself. This would be particularly appropriate for a system of colleges. The student returns only the one-page completed answer sheet to the receiving institution. Incidentally a student can designate up to three colleges to receive the information on the answer sheet. The college merely checks that the student has returned the answer sheet and also checks to see that the college code numbers and student's name have been coded. Each Friday the admissions office sends the answer sheets to the College Board processing center in New York City. Within ten days the college receives back from the College Board the processed student descriptive profile and a turnaround document.

What are its products?

The output documents include:

An 8 1/2 x 11 inch "Student Report" for each student. This indicates the student's responses to the questionnaire--a descriptive profile of the student.

A turnaround coded "Transfer Student Roster" or "Magnetic Tape," or "Deck of IBM-Like Cards." This allows an institution to indicate the final admissions action taken at the end of the processing year on each transfer applicant and serves as the vehicle for generating the institution's Summary Report.

A "Summary Report" for each institution. This provides a complete summary of the responses of the aggregated transfer student to the 47 items (plus local questions, if any) in the questionnaire. Each item is cross-tabulated with the admission action taken (accepted and enrolled, accepted but withdrawn, or rejected). Numbers and percentages are given for all items, and mean and standard deviations are determined where applicable. Also items are cross-tabbed with the kind of institution from which the applicants are applying (two-year public, two-year private, four-year public, four-year private, and grand totals). This phase is completed after fall registration, usually in November. In addition to institutional summary reports, a summary report can be generated for an entire system of colleges.

A "Roster of Sending Institutions." This is an alphabetical roster sent to each participating college with the names of institutions from which transfer applicants were applying indicating how many applied, were accepted and enrolled, accepted but withdrawn, and rejected.

Two-year feeder or sending colleges "Follow-up Summary Statistics" are generated on their students who applied to participating institutions. Tells sending colleges how many of their students applied, were accepted and enrolled at each of the participating four-year colleges.

An "End-of-Year Tape" is available with all the students on it thus allowing an institution through its own computer center or research center to conduct studies of its own design--particularly useful in follow-up studies.

How would institutions use TIS?

In the applicant admissions decision process

In evaluating and determining transfer student admission policies

In planning transfer student recruitment practices and procedures

In planning financial aid programs for transfers

To assist in the academic advising of newly enrolled tranfers

In curriculum development in order to meet the academic needs and demands of these students

In individual counseling

Through the summary report phase, in reporting of descriptive profiles of the transfers for direct reference to faculty, academic deans, and higher eschelon administrators

In completing questionnaires and reports from systems, state, and national agencies

In establishing a base of data on which to build and study over a period of time for trend analysis purposes

Compare one college with the total system of colleges

How much does it cost?

Funding of the program is one of the concerns the College Board has before it attempts to offer the program nationally. It costs approximately $1.75 per student to cover all expenses of the program (printing of materials, mailing, scoring the answer sheets, and generating the individual student reports and the summary reports). It needs to be determined who will pay the tab. Those colleges that participated so far seem to favor institutuioal payment rather than asking the student to pay. If in a system of colleges, they would prefer to have the cost budgeted through the central office. As one of the participating institutions said, it would cost them $15,000 to $20,000 to produce all the data TIS generates if they did it all themselves, whereas TIS costs came to $6,000.

Whatever the case, we need consistent data about transfers so that better planning, better decision-making, better accountability, and most of all better services to transfer students can be attained.

If you are interested in obtaining a set of TIS materials for inspection or review, please contact:

Mr. Darrell Morris
Executive Associate
Program and Field Services
College Entrance Examination Board
888 Seventh Avenue
New York, NY 10019

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JAN 1 3 1978

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES